

## **REMARKS**

Claims 33-52 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-10 and 32 have been cancelled herein, and all of claims 33-52 are new. Claims 11-31 have been previously cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 6-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Slivka et al. (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0225600). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially it will be noted that new independent claim 33 even more positively emphasizes that the rescheduling of objects of at least one of the two groups is performed in parallel. For the Examiner's convenience new claim 33 is presented below as follows:

33. (New) *A method for use by an entity operating at least one mobile platform, for rescheduling objects scheduled for travel on the at least one mobile platform when a scheduling disruption occurs, the method comprising:*

*generating a disruption specification based upon an event, the disruption specification including data identifying objects that need to be rescheduled from an initial itinerary to a new itinerary;*

*analyzing the disruption specification and categorizing the objects into a first group that meet a first criterion, and a second group that does not meet the first criterion; and*

*rescheduling the objects of at least one of the two groups in parallel to generate rescheduling solutions for the objects in each of the first and second groups.*

The above subject matter of claim 33 is not anticipated by Slivka et al. Slivka et al. has been discussed in detail in the previously filed response by the undersigned, but

certain aspects of Slivka et al. bear repeating. For one, Slivka et al. is directed to a system that attempts to re-book passengers using one or more alternative itineraries that are principally focused on the **fare class** of the passenger, and that appear to be performed one passenger at a time. Thus, Slivka et al. will first attempt to rebook a passenger on an alternative flight using the same fare class that the passenger initially had. However, if a passenger had a first class fare, then further attempts are made to determine if a rebooking can be accomplished using a lesser fare class. Then another passenger is addressed using the same operations, and so forth, until an attempt has been made to rebook all the passengers on a given flight. Thus, this operation appears to be essentially what a travel agent would do. The operation is purely sequential and would not appear nearly as time effective as considering the passengers as being “objects” of one or more distinct groups. The present system and method addresses the rescheduling problem by initially creating a disruption specification and then categorizing the objects into one or more different groups. Each group can then be addressed as a whole, and a rescheduling solution determined for the entire group in one processing operation. Each separate group can then be handled. This method is likely to be far more time efficient than the arrangement shown in Slivka et al., which appears to rely on addressing passengers one by one during the rescheduling operations.

Slivka et al. also does not disclose using a plurality of different “engines” to handle analyzing and addressing the rescheduling for crew members separately from other individuals and objects (i.e., baggage) that may require rescheduling, as well as to consider factors such as the availability of alternative aircraft that are potentially useable

for rescheduling solutions. For the Examiner's convenience independent claim 45 is set forth in full below.

*45. (New) A method for rescheduling passengers scheduled for travel on at least one affected mobile platform when a scheduling disruption occurs, the method comprising:*

*providing scheduling information for the at least one affected mobile platform and for other mobile platforms to an integration engine;*

*using the integration engine and the scheduling information to generate a disruption specification based upon an event, the disruption specification including data identifying passengers and crew members needing to be rescheduled from travel on an initial mobile platform, and penalty cost information relating to available actions that may be taken to recover from the disruption and to rebook passengers on an alternative itinerary;*

*simultaneously in parallel, using at least two of:*

*a fleet engine to obtain information from the integration engine regarding the disruption specification, and to generate information relating to alternative mobile platforms that are available for use in connection with a new itinerary;*

*a crew engine to obtain information from the integration engine regarding the disruption specification, and generate information relating to constraints for crew members scheduled to travel on the initial mobile platform; and*

*a passenger engine to generate information relating to constraints affecting passengers scheduled for travel on the initial mobile platform; and*

*wherein at least one of the fleet engine, the crew engine and the passenger engine generate rescheduling solutions for a group comprising one of the passengers or the crew members.*

New claim 52 recites using two of the recited engines "in parallel" to carry out the rescheduling. Slivka et al. does not even remotely disclose or suggest using various types of "engines", let alone using different engines in parallel, to accomplish rescheduling. For at least this reason, it is believed that all of new claims 33-52 are presently in allowable form and such action is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 4 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slivka et al. in view of Yu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,314,361). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slivka et al. in view of Yu in further view of Thangvall (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0105656). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slivka et al. in view of Yu in further view of Official Notice. Claims 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slivka et al. in view of Official Notice. In view of the fact that claims 1-32 have been cancelled and new claims 33-52 presented, and in view of the remarks above concerning Slivka et al. it is believed that these rejections have been rendered moot.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 2, 2009

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/chs

14676742.1